

1	OGONNA M. BROWN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 7589	
2	E-mail: <u>obrown@nevadafirm.com</u> F. THOMAS EDWARDS, ESQ.	
3	Nevada Bar No. 9549 E-mail: tedwards@nevadafirm.com	
4	HOLLEY DRIGGS WALCH FINE WRAY PUZEY & THOMPSON	
5	400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101	
6	Telephone: 702/791-0308	
7	Attorneys for Defendants	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
10	MAX RUHLMAN and ERIC SAMBOLD,	
11	Plaintiffs,	CASE NO.: 2:14-cv-00879-RFB-NJK
12	V.	EMERGENCY MOTION FOR LEAVE TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL FOR
13	GLENN RUDOLFSKY, individually and DBA HOUSE OF DREAMS KAUAI and HOUSE OF	DEFENDANTS (UNOPPOSED)
14	DREAMS HAWAII; KIM D. RUDOLFSKY, AKA KIMI DAPOLITO, individually; and DBA	AND
15	HOUSE OF DREAMS KAUAI and HOUSE OF DREAMS HAWAII,	DEFENDANTS' EMERGENCY REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO FILE
16	Defendants.	RESPONSIVE PLEADING (OPPOSED)
17	Defendants.	
18	Counsel of record for Defendants (individually, "Mr. Rudolfsky" and Mrs. Rudolfsky"	
19	and collectively "Defendants"), Ogonna M. Brown, Esq. and F. Thomas Edwards and the law	
20	firm of Holley Driggs Walch Fine Wray Puzey & Thompson ("HDW" or "Counsel"), hereby	
21	submits this Emergency Motion for Leave to Withdraw as Counsel for Defendants (Unopposed)	
22	and Emergency Request for Extension to File Responsive Pleading (Opposed) (collectively the	
23	"Motion"), and moves this Court for leave to withdraw as counsel for Defendants pursuant to LR	
24	IA 10-6 and NRPC 1.16(b) and requests an extension of the deadline to file a responsive	
25	pleading. This Motion is based upon the memorandum of points and authorities set forth below,	
26	the Declaration and Certification of Ogonna M. Brown, Esq. (the "Brown Declaration"), attached	
27	hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as Exhibit "A", and any oral argument which	
28	this Court may entertain.	

Case 2:14-cv-00879-RFB-NJK Document 41 Filed 10/09/15 Page 2 of 7

Counsel declares that no hearing is presently set in this action and no trial date has been set. No parties have exchanged written discovery. On August 1, 2014, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction ("Motion to Dismiss") (See Dkt. No. 14). On September 23, 2014, Defendants filed a Motion to Stay Case (see Dkt. No. 27) and an Order Granting the Motion to Stay Case was entered on October 21, 2014 (see Dkt. No. 30). On January 30, 2015, Plaintiffs Max Ruhlman and Eric Sambold (the "Plaintiffs") filed a Request for Oral Argument (see Dkt. No. 31) in connection with Defendants' Motion to Dismiss filed herein on August 1, 2014 (see Dkt. No.14). On July 27, 2015, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Determination of Personal Jurisdiction and Convenient Forum Issues (see Dkt. No. 36). On September 27, 2015, the Court entered an Order denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and served the Order on the parties on September 28, 2015 (see Dkt. No. 39). Presently, the deadline to answer the complaint is October 13, 2015.

Counsel therefore requests that this Court enter an Order granting Counsel leave to withdraw as counsel of record for Defendants. HDW has set forth justifiable good cause warranting relief for this Motion in the supporting Declaration of Ms. Brown. *See* Brown Decl. In addition, Counsel requests that Defendants' be given an extension of two (2) weeks after an order on the Motion is entered in order to file a responsive pleading and allow Defendants time to retain replacement counsel and prepare a responsive pleading. *See* Brown Decl., at ¶12.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Requesting leave of court to withdraw as counsel of record for any client is a serious and significant event. Counsel did not enter into this request lightly. At the same time, circumstances have arisen which are beyond the control of Counsel, which render continued representation of the Defendants unsupportable and which render withdrawal as counsel of record the best if not only possible course of action for both the Defendants and Counsel. Counsel fully believes that the facts set forth in the Argument below warrant, if not in fact dictate, that this Court grants the Motion. Counsel therefore believes that good cause exists for this Court to grant Counsel leave to withdraw as counsel of record for the Defendants pursuant to

LR IA 10-6 and NRPC 1.16. Defendants discharged HDW, have been actively looking for new counsel, and Defendants therefore request an extension of two (2) weeks after an order on the Motion is entered in order to allow Defendants time to retain replacement counsel to file a responsive pleading on Defendants' behalf.

I. <u>ARGUMENT</u>

A. STANDARD FOR SEEKING LEAVE TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL OF RECORD.

Counsel must seek leave of court in order to withdraw as counsel of record for Defendants. LR IA 10-6(b) states that "[n]o attorney may withdraw after appearing in a case except by leave of court after notice served on the affected client and opposing counsel." LR IA 10-7(a) incorporates by reference the Model Rules of Professional Conduct (the "NRPC"), as adopted and as amended from time to time by the Nevada State Supreme Court. NRPC 1.16(a)(1) states that a lawyer must withdraw if discharged by the client. NRPC 1.16(b)(1) states that an attorney may withdraw from representing a client if: (1) "[w]ithdrawal can be accomplished without material adverse effect on the interests of the client;" (2) the "client fails substantially to fulfill an obligation to the lawyer regarding the lawyer's services and has been given reasonable warning that the lawyer will withdraw unless the obligation is fulfilled;" (3) the "representation will result in an unreasonable financial burden on the lawyer or has been rendered unreasonably difficult by the client;" or (4) "[o]ther good cause for withdrawal exists."

As demonstrated by the Brown Declaration, good cause exists for this Court to grant HDW leave to withdraw as counsel for Defendants, as (1) Defendants have discharged Counsel; (2) withdrawal can be accomplished with material adverse effect on the Defendants; (3) Defendants failed to fulfill obligations to Counsel despite reasonable warning; (4) the representation will result in an unreasonable financial burden; and (5) the lines of communication between Counsel and Defendants have broken down and irreconcilable differences exist between Counsel and Defendants.

B. COUNSEL SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO WITHDRAW FROM THIS ACTION.

On September 29, 2015, immediately after entry of the Order denying the Motion to Dismiss, Counsel communicated with Defendants regarding the continued representation in this

Case 2:14-cv-00879-RFB-NJK Document 41 Filed 10/09/15 Page 4 of 7

case. *See* Brown Decl. As the lines of communication between Counsel and Defendants had broken down and irreconcilable differences exist between Counsel and Defendants, Defendants sought replacement counsel. <u>Id.</u> As of October 5, 2015, as Defendants were in the process of seeking replacement counsel and as a result, they required an extension of any pending deadlines to allow for retention of replacement counsel. <u>Id.</u> That same day, Counsel contacted opposing counsel, Elizabeth Foley, Esq., to advise that Counsel would be withdrawing from the case and to request the extension. <u>Id.</u> The dialogue with Ms. Foley continued through October 7, 2015, and Ms. Foley advised that she did not oppose withdrawal of Counsel, but that she could not grant any extension. <u>Id.</u> On October 8-9, 2015, Defendants directed Counsel to file a motion to withdraw and to request an extension to respond to the Complaint. <u>Id.</u> October 12, 2015, is a holiday and as a result, the deadline for Defendants to file a responsive pleading is October 13, 2015. Therefore, this Court should grant Counsel leave to withdraw as counsel of record for the Defendants herein.

Withdrawal of Counsel will not have a material adverse effect on Defendants. There are no immediate hearings or trial dates pending in this action which will be postponed should Counsel be permitted to withdraw. Neither is there any outstanding propounded discovery to which Defendants must respond, nor are any depositions currently scheduled. <u>Id.</u> Therefore, Counsel's request should therefore be granted pursuant to NRPC 1.16(a)(3); (b)(1); (b)(5); (b)(6) and (b)(7).

C. DEFENDANTS SHOULD BE GRANTED AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO THE COMPLAINT.

Defendants seek the assistance from this Court to allow Defendants an extension of time for two (2) weeks after the order granting the Motion is entered, as Defendants need time to retain replacement counsel and to prepare a responsive pleading to the Complaint. As set forth in greater detail in the Brown Declaration, Defendants requested an extension in order to allow Defendants time to retain replacement counsel and file a responsive pleading to the Complaint. Defendants' request for an extension was made due to Defendants' inability to locate replacement counsel at the time as Mrs. Rudolfsky was in the midst of pre-surgical testing for

Case 2:14-cv-00879-RFB-NJK Document 41 Filed 10/09/15 Page 5 of 7

several hours on Thursday, October 1, 2015, and surgery on Friday, October 2, 2015, in connection with an ongoing medical condition. Ms. Rudolfsky is currently on medication and under the care of her husband, Mr. Rudolfsky.

Defendants have identified and are currently in the process of retaining replacement counsel, and new counsel, once retained, will have to get up to speed on the case and prepare a responsive pleading to the Complaint. In the meantime, and to avoid any delay, HDW is seeking to withdraw from the case as counsel and is requesting an extension of two (2) weeks after an order on the Motion is entered to allow Defendants retain replacement counsel and file a responsive pleading to Plaintiffs' Complaint.

Pursuant to LR 7-5(d)(2)-(3), the last known addresses and telephone numbers of the

10

11

12

13

15

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

D. CONTACT ADDRESSES AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS FOR ALL AFFECTED PARTIES.

Parties are as follows:

14

Counsel of Record for Defendants:

Ogonna Brown, Esq. Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Wray, Puzey & Thompson 400 South Fourth Street, Suite 300 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 791-0308

17

18

19

Defendants

Address 1: 2825 Shore Drive Merrick, NY 11566

Address 2:

4781 B Kahiliholo Road Kilauea, Kauai, Hawaii 96754

20

Telephone: (808) 755-5869

21

22

23

Counsel for Plaintiffs

Elizabeth Foley, Esq. 601 S Rancho Dr, Las Vegas, NV 89106 (702) 363-2323

24

25

See Brown Decl., at ¶ 19.

26

27

28

II. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

For the reasons stated above, HDW respectfully requests that this Court grant leave allowing HDW to withdraw as counsel of record for Defendants in this action and to allow

Case 2:14-cv-00879-RFB-NJK Document 41 Filed 10/09/15 Page 6 of 7

1	Defendants an extension of two (2) weeks after an order on the Motion is entered in order to
2	allow Defendants time to retain replacement counsel and file a responsive pleading to the
3	Complaint.
4	DATED this 9th day of October, 2015.
5	HOLLEY DRIGGS WALCH FINE WRAY PUZEY & THOMPSON
6	FINE WRAY PUZEY & I HOMPSON
7	/s/ Ogonna M. Brown OGONNA M. BROWN, ESQ.
8	Nevada Bar No. 7589 F. THOMAS EDWARDS, ESQ.
9	Nevada Bar No. 9549 400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor
10	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Defendants
11	Thorneys for Defendants
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that on the 9th day of October, 2015, I caused the document entitled MOTION FOR LEAVE TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS GLEN RUDOLFSKY, INDIVIDUALLY AND DBA HOUSE OF DREAMS KAUAI AND HOUSE OF DREAMS HAWAII; AND KIM D. RUDOLFSKY AKA KIM DAPOLITO, INDIVIDUALLY AND DBA HOUSE OF DREAMS KAUAI AND HOUSE OF DREAMS HAWAII and DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO FILE RESPONSIVE PLEADING, to be served by electronically transmitting the document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following registrants:

Elizabeth J. Foley, Esq. – Efoleylawyer@gmail.com

AN EMPLOYEE OF HOLLEY DRIGGS WALCH FINE WRAY PUZEY & THOMPSON